

創価大学  
国際仏教学高等研究所  
年 報

平成24年度  
(第16号)

**Annual Report  
of  
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology  
at Soka University**

**for the Academic Year 2012**

**Volume XVI**

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所  
東京・2013・八王子

**The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology  
Soka University  
Tokyo・2013**

## Buddhist Nuns in South India as Reflected in the *Andhakatṭhakathā* and in Vajirabuddhi's *Anugaṇṭhipada*

Petra KIEFFER-PÜLZ (Mainz)

The Pāli scriptures preserved belong to the Mahāvihāra tradition of the Theravādin located in Sri Lanka. Some texts, however, originated in other regions and perhaps traditions as for instance the *Milindapañha* or the *Apadāna*.<sup>1</sup> This to my opinion holds true also for a number of Vinaya sources, most of which are only preserved as quotations in the Pāli literature, namely for the *Andhakatṭhakathā*, Vajirabuddhi's *Anugaṇṭhipada*, the *apare* quoted therein, the *Vajirabuddhiṭikā* and, perhaps, the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇīpurāṇaṭikā*. There is to my opinion strong evidence that these texts originated in a tradition connected with South India, if not in South India itself.

That Buddhism flourished in South-India (Andhra Pradesh,<sup>2</sup> Tamilnadu<sup>3</sup>) and that Sri Lankan monks in general were on friendly terms with the monks there at least up to the tenth century AD is a well-known fact; also that many of the outstanding authors of Pāli scriptures came from South India (Buddhaghosa, Buddhadatta, Dhammapāla, etc.). Nevertheless little is known about the South Indian Sthavira/Theriya schools and their relation to the Mahāvihāra of Sri Lanka.

If my suggestion that the Vinaya texts mentioned above originated in some South Indian environment were true, these texts might provide an insight into customs and habits prevalent in South India, they might show us seemingly typical mainstream Mahāvihāra customs which had their roots in some South Indian tradition. When younger texts of the mainstream Mahāvihāra take position on those opinions, deviations or agreements might become visible. Therefore the examination of these texts certainly will lead to a more differentiated picture of the schools of the Theravādins.

Before we can turn to the question what the texts can tell us about Buddhist nuns in South India, we, however, have to present the arguments for the assumption that the sources mentioned originated in South India or at least in a tradition related to South India.

---

<sup>1</sup> Von Hinüber 1996: § 173f., § 123.

<sup>2</sup> Golzio 2010: 30ff.

<sup>3</sup> Kāñcīpuram, Kāverīpaṭṭanam, Nāgappaṭṭanam, etc.

The earliest of our sources, the *Andhakaṭṭhakathā*, a commentary on the *Vinaya* dating from between the first century BC<sup>4</sup> and the 4th or 5th century AD<sup>5</sup> is lost except for forty-one first hand quotations in commentaries to the Pāli *Vinaya*.<sup>6</sup> nineteen are in the *Samantapāsādikā* attributed to Buddhaghosa by tradition (4th/5th century AD), seventeen in the *Vajirabuddhiṭikā*, the oldest *Vinaya* subcommentary (second half of the tenth century AD<sup>7</sup>), and one in the anonymous and undated *Kaṅkhāvitaranīpurāṇaṭikā*, the oldest subcommentary on the *Pātimokkha*, which is younger than the *Vajirabuddhiṭikā*, but probably older than Sāriputta's *Sāratthadīpanī* (after 10th, and before 12th century AD).<sup>8</sup> The distribution of these quotations proves that the *Andhakaṭṭhakathā* was in use up to the 10th or 11th centuries AD.

The quotations preserved in the *Samantapāsādikā* are directly quoted from the *Andhakaṭṭhakathā*. They illuminate that this text belongs to a *Vinaya* tradition different from the mainstream Mahāvihāra, because it uses a different terminology,<sup>9</sup> has a different wording of the formula for the ordination of novices and monks by triple refuge,<sup>10</sup> and classifies offences in other categories than the Mahāvihārin.<sup>11</sup> Furthermore, the *Samantapāsādikā* takes a critical stand on the *Andhakaṭṭhakathā*, indicating that the tradition represented by the *Andhakaṭṭhakathā* was some minority for the author of the *Samantapāsādikā*.<sup>12</sup> One of the quotations renders it probable that the *Andhakaṭṭhakathā* originated in Andhakarāṭṭha, identified with Andhra Pradesh,<sup>13</sup> since the specific

<sup>4</sup> Life time of Mahāsoma Thera, an authority quoted in the *Andhakaṭṭhakathā*.

<sup>5</sup> Date of the completion of the *Samantapāsādikā*.

<sup>6</sup> Kieffer-Pülz 1993; Kieffer-Pülz 2010.

<sup>7</sup> See Kieffer-Pülz 2013: A II 2.

<sup>8</sup> Four seemingly first hand quotations in *Vajirabuddhiṭikā*, *Kaṅkhāvitaranīpurāṇaṭikā* and *Sāratthadīpanī* have in effect literal parallels in the *Samantapāsādikā*. They are partly marked as quotations, but without a source being named. Although the *Andhakaṭṭhakathā* is quoted and mentioned in still younger *Vinaya* commentaries, none of those references are first hand quotations, and therefore they can be left aside, see Kieffer-Pülz 2010: Vjb [5], [18], Kkh-pt [4], Sp-t [5].

<sup>9</sup> *sīmāmaṇḍalaṃ sambandhati* for *sīmaṃ bandhati* (Kieffer-Pülz 1993: [10]); *jagatī* for *vattu* (Kieffer-Pülz 1993: [5]; Kieffer-Pülz 1994).

<sup>10</sup> Kieffer-Pülz 1993: [7], [8].

<sup>11</sup> Kieffer-Pülz 1993: [2], [4], [6], [9], [15].

<sup>12</sup> It rejects eleven statements, declares twice that what is said in the *Andhakaṭṭhakathā* is unnecessary, but not wrong, does not take a position in five cases, and values only one as being well said (*suvuttaṃ*), see Kieffer-Pülz 1993.

<sup>13</sup> According to that quotation the statement that a monk who shares a sleeping place with someone not ordained [Pāc 5 M] on a terrace (*pamukha*) not closed round (*aparikkhitta*), does not commit an offence—a statement which according to the *Vajirabuddhiṭikā* is quoted from the *Sīhaḷaṭṭhakathā*—, has been said with respect to a terrace (*pamukha*) on the earth (*bhūmiyaṃ*) without a base (*jagatī*). The author of the *Samantapāsādikā* relates this explanation to the specific monastic architecture in *Andhakarāṭṭha* where rows of cells (*gabbhapāliyo*) join separate domiciles (*pāṭekkasannivesā*) under one roof (*ekachadanā*). Coḷiya Kassapa's *Vimativinodanīṭikā*, a South Indian *Vinaya* subcommentary of the 13th century, complements that the terrace lay in front of the cells and was fully covered by one joined roof, but not closed round on three sides (Kieffer-Pülz 1993: 191ff.). The architecture described here in fact is not the most prevalent in Andhra Pradesh where the foursided *vihāra* is most common, but there are *vihāras* with one, two, and three wings. There are, for example, two rows of monks' cells in Rāmatīrtha (1st/2nd to 9th centuries AD), Golzio 2010: 32.

monastic architecture described there is detected in South-India.<sup>14</sup> This information together with the deviating Vinaya tradition presented in the *Andhakatṭhakathā* renders probable an origination in South India, a suggestion corroborated by the fact that this text was also used by the *apare*-tradition localized in Kāñcī and Kāverīpaṭṭanam (to which more below).

The *Andhakatṭhakathā* quotations in the *Vajirabuddhiṭṭikā* stem from four different sources. Fourteen are penned by the author of the *Vajirabuddhiṭṭikā*. Five or six are transmitted in Vajirabuddhi's *Anugaṇṭhipada*,<sup>15</sup> two in quotations of some "others" (*apare*), and one probably can be assigned to Upatissa Thera (ca. 5/6th century).

(1) From among these sources the *apare*<sup>16</sup> which are quoted thirty-four times in Vajirabuddhi's *Anugaṇṭhipada* are probably the oldest. They can be located in Kāverīpaṭṭanam and Kāñcī,<sup>17</sup> are at variance with the Pāli *Vinaya* and *Dīghanikāya*,<sup>18</sup> reject an opinion of the Mahāsāṃghikas as not acceptable for *thāvaris* (probably Sthaviras),<sup>19</sup> and once or twice quote the *Andhakatṭhakathā*.<sup>20</sup> Twice their statements are not completely intelligible,<sup>21</sup> because their language seems not to be standard Pāli. *Apāre*-statements paralleled in the *Sāratthadīpanī* are marked there by *keci*, *apare*, *vadanti*, and where Sāriputta takes a position, he and his Sinhalese *Gaṇṭhipadas* differ from them, indicating that the *apare*-tradition was considered a minority by the mainstream Mahāvihāra.<sup>22</sup> Since Kāverīpaṭṭanam flourished till to the 4th century and again from the 6th century onwards, and since the *apare* comment on the *Samantapāsādikā* they are probably to be dated to the later period.

(2) Upatissa Thera was a pupil of Buddhaghosa, a fellow pupil of and the antagonist to Dhammasiri Thera, and head of an own group or school (*gaṇa*). Since Dhammasiri Thera

<sup>14</sup> Such a monastery has been excavated in Kāverīpaṭṭanam, the so called Buddha Vihāra, a monastery dated to the 3rd/4th century by the excavators. It consists in a total of nine cells in a row, provided with a common verandah in front of the cells, Soundara Rajan 1994, p. 27.

<sup>15</sup> After the lifetime of Dhammasiri Thera (ca. 5th/6th century) and before the lifetime of the probably Sinhalese *no takko ti ācariyo* (ca. 10th century).

<sup>16</sup> To my opinion all *apare* references belong to one and the same group, because of the exclusiveness with which the author of the *Anugaṇṭhipada* quotes them (but no *keci*, *eke*, etc.) and the uniform manner in which he does so, and because two quotations of the *apare* refer directly to Kāverīpaṭṭanam and Kāñcī.

<sup>17</sup> Vjb 3597–14 (Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 256]). The quotation, in which the *apare* refer to the custom in the town Kāverīpaṭṭanam to leave the rains residence for clothes on the ninth day of the Pavāraṇā month (Vjb 468,19–21), is quoted in some other text, possibly the *Anugaṇṭhipada*.

<sup>18</sup> Vjb 280,7–9 (Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 177]); the rule that one may keep an object which one had not formally taken possession of for eleven days (contradiction to Niss 10 allowing ten days at most). For deviations from Vin and DN, Vjb 477,16–17; Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 345].

<sup>19</sup> Vjb 1574–6 (Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 87]).

<sup>20</sup> Vjb 300,19–22 (Kieffer-Pülz 2010: Vjb [7]). According to the *apare* the *Andhakatṭhakathā* quotation proves that it is allowed to use requisites given to the Saṅgha with the proviso that they are to be used in the open air according to one's liking. This habit is not shared by the younger mainstream Mahāvihāra to the same degree.

<sup>21</sup> Vjb 468,10–21 (Kieffer-Pülz 2010: Vjb [15]); Vjb 3597–14 (Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 256]).

<sup>22</sup> Vjb 1574–6 (Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 87]) rejection by the *apare* of the Mahāsāṃghika who declare that one might kill an embryo with magical strength developed by meditation. The *apare* are, furthermore, well aware of Nikāya differences as is indicated by their describing a monk who refused some offered donation because of a different Nikāya affiliation of the donor (Vjb 317,23–24; Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 220]).



is a representative of the mainstream Mahāvihāra, his antagonist Upatissa obviously is not. This accords to the fact that his quotations are preserved only in the *Vajirabuddhiṭṭikā* (twenty-eight times), the *Anugaṇṭhipada* (eight times), the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇipurāṇaṭṭikā* (three times), and, probably once in the *Sāratthadīpanī*.<sup>23</sup> He is considered the leading authority by the *Anugaṇṭhipada* once,<sup>24</sup> probably also used the *Andhakattakathā*,<sup>25</sup> and definitely is no Abhayagirivāsin.<sup>26</sup>

(3) The *Anugaṇṭhipada* by Vajirabuddhi<sup>27</sup> is a commentary on the *Vinaya* lost, except for 281 quotations in the *Vajirabuddhiṭṭikā*, and more than fifty quotations in the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇipurāṇaṭṭikā*. It often critically refers to Dhammasiri Thera, mostly because Dhammasiri's insufficient consideration of the *Vinaya* led to contradictions with it. In distinction to Dhammasiri's *Gaṇṭhipada*, the *Anugaṇṭhipada* has no parallels to the Sinhalese *Gaṇṭhipadas* used by Sāriputta, and where its opinions are found in the *Sāratthadīpanī* they are given without a source or are characterized as the statements of some minority with the words *vadanti* or *keci vadanti*.

Regarding its localization the author of the *Anugaṇṭhipada* shows some – but not necessarily first hand – knowledge of Sri Lankan customs.<sup>28</sup> On the other hand he reports on the fabrication of clothes from small woven patches, comparing them to Chinese clothes (*cinasātakam*), a reference presumably hinting at South-India as a commercial partner of China.<sup>29</sup> He uses the word *garukula* (skt. *gurukula*), rarely employed in Pāli (and then mostly in works of South Indians), instead of the more usual *ācariyakula*. He uses as an authoritative source the *Andhakattakathā*, and quotes the *apare* located in

<sup>23</sup> All other references to Upatissa Thera in other *Vinaya* texts refer to the Upatissa Thera of the 1st century BC quoted in the *Samantapāsādikā*. For these Upatissa Theras, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I 176-186.

<sup>24</sup> Regarding the classification of the rule which makes drinking alcohol an offence [Pāc 51 M]. Here Upatissa Thera, the *Anugaṇṭhipada*, the *Vajirabuddhiṭṭikā* and the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇipurāṇaṭṭikā* form one group which is clearly distinguished from the *Sāratthadīpanī* and its *Gaṇṭhipadas* representing the Sri Lankan *gāmaṇāsins* on the one hand, and from the *Vimativinodanīṭṭikā* representing the South Indian *araññavāsins* on the other (Kieffer-Pülz 2005). Although *Anugaṇṭhipada* and *Vajirabuddhiṭṭikā* criticize Upatissa Thera on and off, and even though there exists one Upatissa statement which accords to the three Sinhalese *Gaṇṭhipadas* of Sāriputta (in another case his opinion is mentioned in the *Sāratthadīpanī* as from the *keci*) Upatissa Thera does not belong to the mainstream Mahāvihāra tradition as represented by the *Sāratthadīpanī* and its sources.

<sup>25</sup> One quotation from the *Anugaṇṭhipada* containing an *Andhakattakathā* quotation, according to the *Vajirabuddhiṭṭikā* reflects the doctrine of Upatissa Thera, giving the impression that Upatissa Thera had access to the *Andhakattakathā* too.

<sup>26</sup> Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 241].

<sup>27</sup> This Vajirabuddhi is not the author of the *Vajirabuddhiṭṭikā*, because the latter criticizes the former with such statements as *taṃ sabbaṃ ayuttaṃ, taṃ na sundaraṃ, na taṃ sārato paccetabbaṃ*, etc. (Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 157]), *ayuttaṃ* [Z 171], *duvuttaṃ* [Z 174] *apare* quotation [Z 215], or he declares that something had been *papañcitam*, *atīva* or *bahudhā/bahuṃ papañcitam* or that something has not to be accepted as the best (*na taṃ sārato paccetabbaṃ*) or simply is not good (*na sundaraṃ*). For details, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I 43ff., 213ff.

<sup>28</sup> He mentions the “small *pavāraṇā*” (*cūlapavāraṇā*) in Sri Lanka, but characterizes this notice by the word *kira*, which shows that this has been common knowledge.

<sup>29</sup> Given that in the 7th to 10th centuries there existed lively commercial relations between the Coḷa area and China such a reference would be easily comprehensible for a South Indian reader of the *Anugaṇṭhipada*, but perhaps less for one in Sri Lanka. The *Sāratthadīpanī* and *Vimativinodanīṭṭikā* also refer to this type of cloth, but omit the comparison with the Chinese cloth, Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 176].

Kāverīpaṭṭanam and Kañcī thirty-four times which amounts to around twelve percent of the *Anugaṇṭhipada* quotations preserved. Even though the designation *apare* shows that the author of the *Anugaṇṭhipada* considered them a tradition distinct from his own,<sup>30</sup> the fact that he quotes them often and casually with local information only meaningful to monks of that region, make it probable that the *apare* tradition was geographically close and of sufficient importance for the author of the *Anugaṇṭhipada* to give attention to it, and thus that the *Anugaṇṭhipada* was written for South Indian readers.<sup>31</sup>

(4) Regarding the author of the *Vajirabuddhiṭkā*, the identification with a Vajirabuddhi is relatively late. The examination of the quotations from Vajirabuddhi's *Anugaṇṭhipada* clearly has proven that this Vajirabuddhi and the author of the *Vajirabuddhiṭkā* cannot be identical. It may be that the identification of the author of the *Vajirabuddhiṭkā* with one Vajirabuddhi may have resulted from the title of the text which was in usage already in the 12th century AD. Without going into detail here I want to state that the author of the *Vajirabuddhiṭkā* most likely lived in the second half of the tenth century, that he used sources which originated in Sri Lanka, namely, Dhammasiri's *Khuddasikkhā* (5th/6th century AD), Dhammasiri's *Gaṇṭhipada*,<sup>32</sup> and Upasena's commentary on the *Niddesa* (after the 9th century AD).<sup>33</sup> He shows knowledge of the Sinhalese language,<sup>34</sup> has first hand knowledge of habits and customs in Sri Lanka,<sup>35</sup> is the only author of a Pāli text who names *dīpavāsino*,<sup>36</sup> *tambapaṇṇivāsino*,<sup>37</sup> or *jambudīpavāsino* as sources of variant

<sup>30</sup> This is corroborated by his criticism towards them. In three cases he rejects the opinions of the *apare* with the words that the Ācariyas or Vinayadharas do not speak in that way (Vjb 445,24–25; 468,21,25),

<sup>31</sup> The *Anugaṇṭhipada* did neither belong to the Abhayagiri-vāsin nor to the mainstream Mahāvihāra tradition, as represented by the *Sāratthadīpanī*. This is indicated by the position the *Anugaṇṭhipada* takes with respect to the rule which prohibits the consumption of alcohol, Kieffer-Pülz 2005.

<sup>32</sup> With about 340 quotations it is one of the main sources of the *Vajirabuddhiṭkā*. Identification as a Sri Lankan product results from the roughly eighty quotations for which there are parallels in the Sinhalese *Gaṇṭhipadas* used by Sāriputta in his *Sāratthadīpanī*. See Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I 202–205.

<sup>33</sup> The *Vajirabuddhiṭkā* shares a large portion of its introduction with this text, see Kieffer-Pülz 2009.

<sup>34</sup> He explains the Pāli word *vasa* to mean “poison” via the Sinhalese forms *vasa* and *visa*, deduced from Skt. *viṣa*. The regular Pāli form is *visa*. He possibly also is the source of the single verse from a work by Mātṛceṭa (Vjb 15,15–16 = VAV 2.10 + 2.13) handed down in medieval Sinhalese literature from the 12th century onwards. See Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I 100f.

<sup>35</sup> This is shown when he states that even at his time monks in Sri Lanka advance the *mahāpavāraṇā* to the 14th (instead of the regular 15th), or when he mentions details of the *cūḷapavāraṇā*.

<sup>36</sup> “Inhabitants of the island (i.e. Sri Lanka)”; Vjb 106,1–2 (*uppalagandhā uppalabhāvā*); Vjb 116,24 (reading *vediyā vā* where the *Vajirabuddhiṭkā* has *vediyi vā*); Vjb 466,3–4: *Mahā-aṭṭhakathāyam pi “saṅkāsayissantī” ti pāṭho, dīpavāsino “saṅkāpayissantī” ti paṭhanti kira*.

Furthermore, Vajirabuddhi twice quotes the content of some of the *dīpavāsins'* sayings, Vjb 496,21–497,1 (Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 365]: “*evaṃ sante corikāya katasadisam hoti tasmā na vaṭṭatī*” *ti dīpavāsino vadanti kira*. Vjb 530,24–25: “*corikāya gahitattā na pāpuṇātī*” *ti vacanato “kuṭisodhanam vaṭṭatī” ti ca dīpavāsino vadanti kira*. In all these cases, however, Vajirabuddhi uses the word *kira* (skt. *kiḷa*) after the verb, indicating that he tells this from hearsay or that this is well known at his time. So it is possible that some of his information on Sri Lanka or the Sri Lankan readings were common knowledge at his time, and that he adopted this intelligence without having checked it personally. For *kira*, see Kieffer-Pülz 2012: I 105f.

<sup>37</sup> “Inhabitants of Tambapaṇṇi (i.e. Sri Lanka)”; Vjb 186,20–21: *Tambapaṇṇivāsino itthirūpaṃ likhitam, kaṭikapaṭaṇ ca na chupanti kira. ākarato muttamatto*.

readings,<sup>38</sup> and who compares an *andhakapotthaka* with various *sīhaḷapotthakas*<sup>39</sup> with respect to the reading of a *kammavācā*.<sup>40</sup>

On the other hand he uses the *Andhakaṭṭhakathā*, on which he takes a positive stand. Furthermore, the *Anugaṇṭhipada* is his second most important source after Dhammasiri's *Gaṇṭhipada*, and, unlike the author of the *Samantapāsādikā*, the author of the *Vajirabuddhiṭikā* takes the *Andhakaṭṭhakathā* to be an authoritative text, trying to show its conformity with the likewise authoritative *Samantapāsādikā*, and thus allaying the distance between both texts.<sup>41</sup> In addition he shows knowledge of features special for South India when he states that a certain perfumed powder was favored in *ariyadesa*,<sup>42</sup> here probably referring to South India,<sup>43</sup> or quotes Tamils,<sup>44</sup> or refers to the park in the town Kāñcī<sup>45</sup> or a custom of the *bhikkhus* in Kāverīpattanam.<sup>46</sup> He is aware of other Buddhist schools, especially the Mahāsaṃghikas<sup>47</sup> prevalent in South India, and besides Sinhalese knew Tamil.<sup>48</sup> He thus betrays knowledge of Sri Lankan and South Indian cultures, and therefore could well have been a native of Andhra Pradesh who lived for some time in Sri Lanka (Anurādhapura)<sup>49</sup> and for some time in Kāñcī and/or

<sup>38</sup> "Inhabitants of India"; Vjb 384,7–8: "sikkhamānaṃ" ti pāṭhaṃ dīpavāsino rocenti kiriyākiriyaṭṭā, jambudīpavāsino "sikkhamānā" ti. tassattho sikkhādharmamānanato sikkhamānā ti.

<sup>39</sup> These might have been *kammavācā* manuscripts.

<sup>40</sup> The reading mentioned corresponds to that handed down in the *Vinaya* as we have it today. Vjb 457,26–30: "yassāyasmato khamati etissā sīmāya samānasaṃvāsāya ekūposathāya samugghāto, so tuṇhassā" ti Andhakapotthake, Sīhaḷapotthakesu ca kesuci pāṭho atthi. kesuci "samugghāto etissā sīmāya" ti paṭhamameḷi likhanti, kesuci "etissā sīmāya samugghāto" ti ca.

<sup>41</sup> In addition he sometimes presupposes the knowledge of what was written in the *Andhakaṭṭhakathā* in that he discusses something written there without quoting it, thus writing for readers who knew this text, see Kieffer-Pülz 2010: Vjb [13], [14].

<sup>42</sup> Characterized by *kira* which makes it possible that it was a generally known fact.

<sup>43</sup> *Ariyadesa* is a rare term in Pāli found only in commentaries ascribed to the South Indian Dhammapāla (Sv-pt, Ud-a) and once in the *Sāratthadīpanī* where Sāriputta (who often borrows from Dhammapāla) relates it to the monks of Jambudīpa. It is, furthermore, used in the *Mahāvamsa* (61.3; 63.4) where it refers to people from South India. *Ariyadesa* in a narrower sense refers to Andhra Pradesh (Ramchandran 1996, 120). *Ariyadesa* refers to Andhra Pradesh (the region beginning with the Southern limit of Dandaka) also in Tamil Sangam literature (Proceedings 1923: 357).

<sup>44</sup> Vjb 298: *ekarasena nāthakaraṇā* (v.l. *ekaraṇasneharanā*) iti *damilā*.

<sup>45</sup> Vjb 380,17; Sāriputta (Sp-ṭ III 126,20–21) later on defines it simply as a park within a town, omitting the reference to Kāñcī.

<sup>46</sup> Vjb 468,11–15: *nimantito yeva nāma hoti* ti (Sp 1070,1) *ettha upāsakehi "imasmim nāma divase dānādini karoma, sabbe sannipatantū" ti katāya pi katikāya gantum vaṭṭati. pavāraṇāya navamito paṭṭhāya paṃsukūlikacīvarameḷi pariyesitum Kāvīrapattane viya sabbesameḷi gantum vaṭṭati anusamvaccharameḷi niyamato upāsakehi sajjitvā ṭhapanato*. This quotation is part of a longer quotation not marked unambiguously.

<sup>47</sup> Vjb 157,1; 335,17–18; 576,12.

<sup>48</sup> One reproach Sāriputta makes against the author of *Vajirabuddhiṭikā* is that he mixes up languages in his commentary (*bhāsantarehi sammissameḷi likhitaṃ*, Sp-ṭ I 2,10). The *Vajirabuddhiṭikā* in fact shows that its author had also access to Sanskrit texts, and it contains Sanskrit words not or not properly transferred into Pāli. *pratyavajjānaṃ* (Vjb 14,7) instead of an expected *\*paccavajjānaṃ*; formation *gri* for *giri* (Vjb 5,15) on metrical reasons in analogy to *siri* (skt. *śrī*) (Bollée 1985: 179, Anm. 2); *vyākhyā* (Vjb 3,22; 14,7) otherwise rarely used, and then in younger texts; *vivākya* (Vjb 9,17) (for *avivākya*?), etc. See Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I 129ff.

<sup>49</sup> This presupposes that the Mahāvihāra still lived there, and thus leads to a date before the 11th century.

Kāverīpaṭṭanam, or a native of Sri Lanka who spent some time in South India.<sup>50</sup>

Date	Vinaya	Pātimokkha
1st cent. BC–4th/5th cent. AD	<i>Early Sthalaṭṭhakathā:</i> <i>Kurundī</i> <i>Mahāpaccarī</i> <i>Mahā-Aṭṭhakathā</i>	
1st cent. BC–4th/5th cent. AD	<i>Andhakattakathā</i>	
4th/5th cent. AD	Samantapāsādikā	Kaṅkhāvitaranī (after the Samantapāsādikā)
5th/6th cent. AD	<i>Upatissa Thera</i> <i>Dhammasiri Thera</i> <i>Dhammasiri's Gaṇṭhipada</i>	
ca. 6th cent. AD	<i>apare in Vajirabuddhi's Anugaṇṭhipada</i>	
after 6th before 2nd half of the 10th cent.	<i>Vajirabuddhi's Anugaṇṭhipada</i>	
before 2nd half of 10th cent. AD	<i>no takko ti ācariyo</i> (after the Anugaṇṭhipada)	
2nd half of the 10th cent. AD	Vajirabuddhiṭkā	
after 2nd half of the 10th cent. AD before 12th century		Kaṅkhāvitaranīpurāṇaṭkā
2nd half of the 12th cent. AD	Sāriputta's Sāratthadīpanī	
1st half of the 13th cent. AD	Coliya Kassapa's Vimativinodanīṭkā	

Overview of the Sources (*italics* = texts preserved in form of quotations only)

Important in the present context is the question whether these texts were written at a time when a nuns' community still existed. The fact that a commentator comments on the nuns' portions of *Vinaya* and *Aṭṭhakathā* is no proof in that respect, because even younger sub-commentaries written at a time when the nuns' tradition was extinct in Sri Lanka commented on the *bhikkhunīs'* sections, albeit sometimes a little less detailed. The author of the *Anugaṇṭhipada*, however, tells us that at his time (*etarahi*) it was usual practice that a monk, not agreed upon as an adviser of nuns (*asammata ovādaka*) instructed nuns (Vjb 307,5–308,15, Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 209]), and the author of the *Vajirabuddhiṭkā* informs us that at his time (*etarahi*) the nuns exclusively went to the monks' community on the

<sup>50</sup> For a more detailed discussion of the authorship of the *Vajirabuddhiṭkā*, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I A II 1.



fourteenth and asked when the *uposatha* should take place (*kadā ayya uposatho*).<sup>51</sup> We do, however, not know whether this refers to Sri Lanka or South India.

### What the texts can tell us about *bhikkhunīs*

With respect to the question what the texts can tell us about *bhikkhunīs* one has to be aware that the commentaries on *Vinaya* and *Pātimokkha* comment on a word at its first place of appearance, and therefore become gradually thinner to the end. Accordingly the *Samantapāsādikā*'s section on the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga* (49 pages = Sp 900–949) is much shorter than that on the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga* (899 pages = Sp 1–899) corresponding to 3.3 percent of the whole text, compared to that on the *Bhikkhuvibhaṅga* which equates to 63.5 percent. In case of the *Vinaya* sources reckoned as being affiliated to South India we merely have quotations, that is to say chips from these texts. Among them only few refer to *bhikkhunīs*.

In the subcommentarial literature the portion on *bhikkhunīs* equates to 5.7 percent in the *Vajirabuddhiṭkā*, but only to 1.5 percent in the younger commentaries by Sāriputta (2nd half 12th cent. AD) and Coliya Kassapa (1st half 13th cent. AD) which both originated after the extinction of the nuns' community.

From the forty-one *Andhakāṭṭhakathā* quotations only four refer to rules of the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga*, namely three to Sgh 3 N<sup>52</sup> and one to Pāc 7 N.<sup>53</sup> From the 281 *Anugaṇṭhipada* quotations only fourteen (Pār 1, Sgh 3, Pāc 7, 9, 10, 71–73, 81, Nigamana) refer to the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga*, and from the thirty-four *apare* quotations only three (Pār 1, Sgh 3 N). None of the texts comments on the *bhikkhunī* chapter of the *Cullavagga* which is dealt with only in the *Vajirabuddhiṭkā* to some extent. Hence the number of quotations referring to nuns is limited. The following are the topics touched on:

- the classification system of the *Pātimokkha* rules<sup>54</sup>
- reordination of a nun after sex change in the light of the prohibition for nuns to formally leave the nuns' community
- strict separation of monks' and nuns' communities with respect to the usage of a community's property<sup>55</sup>
- proof that a rule against accepting raw grain did not exist for nuns only (Pācittiya 9 for nuns), but also for monks<sup>56</sup>
- *sikkhamānā* training starts with twelve, ordination with fourteen at the earliest

<sup>51</sup> The *Samantapāsādikā* (794,13–17) transmits two statements. According to the first, nuns go and ask for *uposatha* on the fourteenth, if *uposatha* takes place on the fifteenth, and on the thirteenth, if it takes place on the fourteenth. According to the second opinion which is that of the Mahāpaccarī the nuns go exclusively on the thirteenth and ask whether *uposatha* takes place on the fourteenth or fifteenth. Vjb 305,13–15: *ayaṃ uposatho cātuddasiko ti pucchitabban ti vuttam* (≠ Sp 794,16–17) *tam pi terasiyaṃ yeva, etarahi pana bhikkhuniyo cātuddasiyaṃ yeva gantvā “kadā ayya uposatho” ti pucchanti*. Sāriputta also presents the question the nuns ask, but omits any reference as to the date which is coherent regarding the fact that nuns were no longer present in Sri Lanka at this time.

<sup>52</sup> Kieffer-Pülz 2010: Vjb [9]–[10], Kkh-pt [3].

<sup>53</sup> Kieffer-Pülz 2010: Vjb [11].

<sup>54</sup> Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 15].

<sup>55</sup> Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 266].

<sup>56</sup> Kieffer-Pülz 2013: B [Z 265]

(Pācittiya 71–73 for nuns)

- subrules of Saṅghādisesa 3 for nuns

In the following we will deal with the subject of the installation of a nuns' adviser, with the definitions of *gāma* and *gāmūpacāra* in the frame of Sgh 3 N, and with the subrule of Sgh 3 N making it an offence to stay behind a group alone.

### The installation of a *bhikkhunovādaka*

The position of an adviser of nuns (*bhikkhunovādaka*) who every fortnight had to advise nuns ranked high as is demonstrated by the skills the *Vinaya* demands of a monk qualified for this office and by the fact that a *ñatticatutthakamma* instead of the usual *ñattidutiyakamma* is required.<sup>57</sup> An adviser of nuns regularly agreed upon is described as *sammata*. In the Word Analysis to Pāc 24 M which makes it an offence for monks to claim that *theras* teach nuns for the sake of gain, one who teaches is described as one “fully ordained [and] agreed upon [as a *bhikkhunovādaka*]” (*upasampanna sammata*, Vin IV 58,16–17). In the casuistry the other three pairs are listed out of conformity (Vin IV 58,23ff.).

*upasampanna asammata* “one fully ordained, [but] not agreed upon”

*anupasampanna sammata* “one unordained, [but] agreed upon”

*anupasampanna asammata* “one unordained [and] not agreed upon”

Even though all three are seemingly incapable to act as *bhikkhunovādakas*, if one follows the rules in the *Vinaya*, the commentaries had to offer reasonable explanations for them. This at the same time established the possibility of some innovation. Regarding the first, i.e. the *upasampanna asammata*, the *Samantapāsādikā* explains this to mean “one fully ordained, but not agreed upon [as a *bhikkhunovādaka*]” and to refer to a monk installed (*thapita*) as a *bhikkhunovādaka*. A “*bhikkhunovādaka* agreed upon” or the monks' community are named as the ones who may perform such an installation. Thus the *Samantapāsādikā* describes some formal course of action instead of the legal procedure requested in the *Vinaya*. A passage from the *Andhakatṭhakathā* quoted in the *Anugāṇṭhipada* in this context tells us that *upasampanna asammata* refers to a monk installed (*thapita*) as a *bhikkhunovādaka* by the community with the following words: “Support the nuns' community. Teach the nuns and cause comfort for the monks' community.” Thus the installation described in the *Samantapāsādikā* was accepted already at the time and in the tradition of the *Andhakatṭhakathā*, with the only difference that in the *Andhakatṭhakathā* a *bhikkhunovādaka* as the one who installs is not mentioned. Whether or not this reflects some further development, we do not know.<sup>58</sup> The

<sup>57</sup> Nevertheless, already the *Cullavagga* hints at the fact, that such highly qualified monks were rare, because it contains the allowance that all others except an ignorant monk may instruct the *bhikkhunīs* (Vin II 265,4–5).

<sup>58</sup> Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 209].

*Andhakatṭhakathā* quotation, however, shows that the procedure for becoming a *bhikkhunovādaka* was facilitated at an early date, that the simplified method replaces the legal procedure requested in the *Vinaya*, that this method was accepted in the *Andhakatṭhakathā* tradition, and that it found its way into the mainstream Mahāvihāra.

The hurdle of finding a monk qualified enough for becoming a *bhikkhunovādaka* was already overcome in the *Vinaya* to some degree, in that the allowance to advise nuns was given to every one except an ignorant, an ill or a travelling monk.<sup>59</sup> The hurdle of agreeing upon a *bhikkhunovādaka* established in the *Vinaya* obviously was overcome at the time of the *Andhakatṭhakathā* at the latest. The fact that the procedure was simplified makes one assume that the number of nuns was not marginal and the procedure prescribed in the *Vinaya* too complicated for daily usage. Since each nun had to receive instruction every fortnight, each monks' monastery with nunneries in its periphery had to provide a *bhikkhunovādaka* which means that it had to have an able monk. Given that communities were distributed over wide regions, this certainly was no easy task. Already the *Vinaya* tells us that in case neither a *bhikkhunovādaka* is there nor an able monk, nuns should be told: "There is no monk agreed upon as exhorter of the nuns. Let the Order of nuns strive on with friendliness" (*pāsādikena sampādetu*)" (BD V 366). As a dispute in the *Vajirabuddhiṭkā* shows some (perhaps fictitious) opponents were of the opinion that saying even that much made the monk who spoke a *bhikkhunovādaka*.

<i>Vinaya</i>	<i>Andhakatṭhakathā</i>	<i>Samantapāsādikā</i>
<i>sammata bhikkhunovādaka</i> a nun's adviser is agreed upon	<i>ṭhapita bhikkhunovādaka</i> a nun's adviser is installed	<i>ṭhapita bhikkhunovādaka</i> a nun's adviser is installed
method: <i>ñātticatutthakamma</i>	method: installation by a monks' community	method: installation by a monks' community installation by a nuns' adviser agreed upon

Agreeing upon or installing a *bhikkhunovādaka*

The *upasampanna asammata* is relevant for another rule too, namely for Pāc 21 M which makes it an offence for monks, if an *asammata bhikkhu* teaches nuns. The *Vajirabuddhiṭkā* states that in this context *asammata* has to be understood as *aṭhapita*, and that this is also the opinion of the Abhayagirivāsin.<sup>60</sup> Thus these groups applied Pāc 21 M also to the *bhikkhunovādakas* who were installed, not only to those agreed upon. As the *Vajirabuddhiṭkā* tells us the *Anugaṇṭhipada* rejects the maxime of the Abhayagirivāsin and accepts only the opinion of the *Andhakatṭhakathā* which equates

<sup>59</sup> To be (1) virtuous and to keep to the *Pātimokkha*, (2) to be very learned (*bahussuta*), (3) to know both *Pātimokkhas* by heart and in detail, (4) to own an agreeable speech and language, (5) to be agreeable to the nuns, (6) to be able to teach nuns, (7) to never have transgressed one of the weighty rules (i.e. *Pārājika*, *Sgh*), (8) to be ordained at least 20 years. These were the qualities originally requested.

<sup>60</sup> It, by the way, also is the opinion later followed by Sāriputta in his *Sāratthadīpanī* who nevertheless dropped the reference to the Abhayagirivāsin.

*asammata* with *ṭhapita*,<sup>61</sup> arguing that nowadays (*etarahi*), i.e. at the time of the *Anugaṇṭhipada*, an adviser not agreed upon (*ovādaka asammata*) regularly functions as a *bhikkhunovādaka*. For this tradition Pāc 21 M therefore must have become obsolete with the introduction of the new method to make someone a *bhikkhunovādaka*.<sup>62</sup>

<i>Vajirabuddhiṭkā</i> , Abhayagirivāsin <i>Sāratthadīpanī</i>	<i>Andhakatṭhakathā</i> , <i>Anugaṇṭhipada</i>
<i>asammata</i> = <i>aṭhapita</i>	<i>asammata</i> = <i>ṭhapita</i>
Pācittiya 21 for monks is applied to <i>asammata</i> and <i>aṭhapita</i>	Pācittiya 21 for monks is obsolete

Interpretation of Pācittiya 21

### Samghādisesa 3 for Nuns

Sgh 3 N makes it an offence for nuns to go to another village alone (*ekā gāmantaraṃ gaccheyya*), to go to the other side of a river alone (*ekā nadīpāraṃ gaccheyya*), to stay separated for one night alone (*ekā rattiṃ vippavaseyya*), and to stay behind the group of nuns alone (*ekā gaṇamhā ohīyeyya*). Most of the references to nuns in our texts are connected with Sgh 3 N: three quotations from the *Andhakatṭhakathā*, five from the *Anugaṇṭhipada*, and two of the *apare* are handed down in this context. Relevant for all these rules is the definition of a “village” (*gāma*) and “the precincts of a village” (*gāmūpacāra*), since nuns had to live within settlements and, if they left, thereby entering the wilderness, they had to walk with at least a second nun as a companion. We therefore will deal with the definitions of *gāma* and *gāmūpacāra*, before we discuss the last subrule of Sgh 3 N, i.e. staying behind the group of nuns alone.

Ground in the *Vinaya* is divided into settlements and non-settlements. The generic term for settlements is “village” (*gāma*), for non-settlements “wilderness” (*arañña*) or, more precisely, “wilderness without settlements” (*agāmaka arañña*). In addition to the extension of a *gāma*, that of the precincts of a *gāma* (*gāmūpacāra*) have to be taken into account. *Gāmas* are differentiated in enclosed (*parikkhitta*) and unenclosed (*aparikkhitta*) *gāmas*. The boundary of an enclosed *gāma* is its enclosure (*parikkhepa*) that of an unenclosed *gāma* had to be defined. Both types of *gāmas*, in addition, had precincts (*gāmūpacāra*) which also had to be determined. According to a definition of the *gāmūpacāra* of an unenclosed *gāma* in the *Samantapāsādikā* in the context of Sgh 3 N “the space appropriate for the enclosure of a village” (*parikkhepārahaṭṭhāna*, Sp 911,3–4) or, in connection with the rules for the monastic boundary, “a space for the enclosure” (*parikkhepokāsa*, Sp 1050,17–18) is its boundary. According to this definition the

<sup>61</sup> As a further quotation from some *Porāṇaṇṭhipada*, valued by the author of the *Vajirabuddhiṭkā* as conforming to the *Andhakatṭhakathā*, shows the installation by the community is understood as some formal act resulting from the consent of the community (*saṅghānumati*).

<sup>62</sup> This, by the way, shows that the Abhayagirivāsin too accepted the new method of making *bhikkhunovādakas*, and that they applied Pāc 21 M to all but the *sammata* and *ṭhapita bhikkhunovādakas*. Kieffer-Pülz 2010: Vjb [8]; Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 209].



*gāmūpacāra* of an unenclosed *gāma* would run at exactly the same spot where in case of an enclosed village the enclosure is situated. Thus *gāma* and *gāmūpacāra* would be identical. They, therefore, could be transgressed with one step which is expressed by forms of the verb *atikkamati*. This in fact is the verb chosen in the context of Sgh 3 N in connection with the word *gāmūpacāra*.<sup>63</sup>

*Gāma* and *gāmūpacāra* are defined a second time, this time in the *Vinaya* (III 46,27–30) in the context of Pār 2 M. Here the *gāmūpacāra* of an enclosed village is defined by one stone throw from the village gate, that of an unenclosed village by one stone throw from the “precincts of a house” (*gharūpacāra*) (certainly at the border of that village). Neither is the *gharūpacāra* defined nor is the method to determine the village boundary described there for an unenclosed village. The *Mahā-Aṭṭhakathā* quoted by the *Samantapāsādikā* as authoritative in this respect explains that one stone throw from the *gharūpacāra* defines the village boundary, another one (this time probably from the village boundary) determines the *gāmūpacāra* (Sp 299,25–300,7).<sup>64</sup> This definition is also valid for Pāc 85 M according to the *Samantapāsādikā*.<sup>65</sup> Thus the *gāmūpacāra* in that case consists in a circumference of the *gāma* with a radius of one stone throw. The verb used in contexts where this definition is applied is *okkamati*, “to enter”, because the extension of the *upacāra* does not allow to transgress it with one step.

In the context of Sgh 3 N the *Vajirabuddhiṭṭhikā* quotes several sources with respect to these definitions. An anonymous source critically remarks that the *Andhakattṭhakathā* mentions as *gāmūpacāra* only the spot appropriate for an enclosure, thus ignoring the differentiation of the *Vinaya*. An *Andhakattṭhakathā* quotation subsequently presented by the anonymous source<sup>66</sup> confirms that the *Andhakattṭhakathā* here applied the *gāmūpacāra* definition given in the context of Sgh 3 N. In the same context the *Anugaṇṭhipada* quotes the *apare* who report that there exist manuscripts which have *okkamati* instead of *atikkamati* in the context of Sgh 3 N, an indication that there the *gāmūpacāra* definition of Pār 2 M was applied to Sgh 3 N. This opinion is rejected by the *apare*.<sup>67</sup> Finally the *Vajirabuddhiṭṭhikā* quotes the probably Sinhalese *no takko ti ācariyo*. He rejects the statement of the anonymous source that the *Andhakattṭhakathā* ignored

<sup>63</sup> For the definition of *arañña* the *Samantapāsādikā* in this context resorts to the *Vibhaṅga* (251) where *arañña* is defined as each ground outside of the village gate (*araññan ti nikkhamitvā bahi indakhilā sabbam etam araññaṃ*). This definition of *arañña* tallies with the definition equating *gāmūpacāra* with *gāma*.

<sup>64</sup> The *Samantapāsādikā* quotes the *Kurundī* and the *Mahāpaccarī* with definitions of the precincts of a house (*gharūpacāra*), and an explanation how to determine the precincts of a village (*gāmūpacāra*), namely by a stone throw from the *gharūpacāra*. Like the *Vinaya* both texts thus omit the determination of the village boundary.

<sup>65</sup> Sp 883,16–17: *aparikkhittassa gāmassa upacāro adinnādāne vuttanayen’ eva veditabbo*. “The precincts of an unenclosed village are to be known exactly according to the method stated in the [rule] ‘seizing the ungiven’ [Pār 2 M].”

<sup>66</sup> According to it a monk who breaks Pāc 85 M commits an offence, if he sets his foot over the *gāmūpacāra* (*atikkamati*). Interestingly the *Andhakattṭhakathā* states *taṃ upacāraṃ paṭhamam pādamaṃ atikkamantassa*, whereas in all other instances the causative of *atikkamati* namely *atikkāmeti* is used in those cases.

<sup>67</sup> Vjb 358,20–21: “*aparikkhittassa gāmassa upacāraṃ okkamantiyā ti pi ekaccesu dissati, taṃ na gahetabban’ ti apare’ ti vuttaṃ*. “[In *Vajirabuddhi*’s *Anugaṇṭhipada*] it is said, that others [state], ‘Even [the reading], »If [a nun] enters the precincts of an unenclosed village«, appears in some [manuscripts], this is not to be accepted.” See Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 255].



the differentiation (between the readings *okkamati* and *atikkamati*) of the *Vinaya* with the argument that in some *Vinaya* manuscripts the reading *atikkamati* (instead of *okkamati*) is found in Pāc 85 M, and that this is accepted as the reading of the *Andhakaṭṭhakathā*.<sup>68</sup> Thus the *Andhakaṭṭhakathā* had the reading *atikkamati* in Pāc 85 M<sup>69</sup> and Sgh 3 N, and, as we will see below, even in Pār 2 M. It thus applied the definition equating *gāmūpacāra* with *gāma* everywhere. Contrary to that, the mainstream Mahāvihāra differentiates between *atikkamati* (Sgh 3 N) and *okkamati* (Pār 2 M, Pāc 85 M), accepting the definition which equates *gāma* with *gāmūpacāra* only for Sgh 3 N.<sup>70</sup> The *Kaṅkhāvitarāṇīpurāṇaṭīkā* in the commentary to Pār 2 M preserves an *Andhakaṭṭhakathā* quotation<sup>71</sup> which consists in the definition of a *gāmūpacāra*, equating it with the *gāma* and corresponding nearly literally to the definition handed down in the *Samantapāsādikā* in the section on monastic boundaries (Sp 1050,17–18: *gāmaparikkhepokāsa*). The *Andhakaṭṭhakathā*, therefore, is a possible source for the *Samantapāsādikā*'s *gāmūpacāra*-definition in this context.

The two contradictory definitions of *gāmūpacāra* preserved in the *Samantapāsādikā*<sup>72</sup> may therefore go back to a South Indian (*Andhakaṭṭhakathā*) and a Sri Lankan (*Mahā-Aṭṭhakathā*) tradition.<sup>73</sup> It would be interesting to find out whether the deviating *gāmūpacāra* definitions are only caused by the incomplete *gāma* and *gāmūpacāra* definitions of the *Vinaya* and the special rules for nuns, or whether an actual difference of village types in South India and Sri Lanka was at the bottom of this divergence.

source	parikkhitta gāma		aparikkhitta gāma	
	gāma	gāmūpacā	gāma	gāmūpacāra
Vinaya (Pārājika 2 M)	–	boundary = one stone throw from the village gate	–	boundary = one stone throw from the precincts of a house ( <i>gharūpacāra</i> )

<sup>68</sup> Interestingly the confusion of the readings *okkamati* and *atikkamati* in the various rules in the *Vinaya* left traces even in manuscripts of the 19th century and even in the first Kkh edition of the PTS by D. Maskell.

<sup>69</sup> The author of the *Vajirabuddhiṭīkā* with respect to Pāc 85 M suggests to apply the definition which equates *gāmūpacāra* with *gāma*, and thus proposes to follow the *Andhakaṭṭhakathā* tradition, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 37].

<sup>70</sup> Kieffer-Pülz 2010: Vjb [9].

<sup>71</sup> Here the *Kaṅkhāvitarāṇīpurāṇaṭīkā* has a very interesting section, in which it deals with the various definitions of *gāma* and *gāmūpacāra* in the *Vinaya* (Kkh-pt 29,24–40,29).

<sup>72</sup> They certainly were motivated by the incomplete definitions in the Word Analysis to Pār 2 M.

<sup>73</sup> The position of the *Kurundī* and the *Mahāpaccarī* according to the statement of the *Kaṅkhāvitarāṇīpurāṇaṭīkā*, accorded to that of the *Andhakaṭṭhakathā*. No such quotations are handed down. It cannot be excluded that the author of the Kkh-pt bases this opinion on the quotations from *Kurundī* and *Mahāpaccarī* handed down in the *Samantapāsādikā* in this context. To analyze the coincidence of these two Sri Lankan commentaries with the South Indian *Andhakaṭṭhakathā* will eventually be possible, if one examines the quotations from these early commentaries and their mutual relation. We, however, do not know whether they had one definition for all rules or whether they differentiated. Kkh-pt 33,3–5: *tasmā “gāmūpacāro ti parikkhittassa gāmassa parikkhepo, aparikkhittassa gāmassa parikkhepokāso” ti* (= Sp 1050,17–18) *Andhakaṭṭhakathāyaṃ vuttan ti vedibbaṃ. tathā Kurundiyaṃ, Mahāpaccariyaṃ ca*. See Kieffer-Pülz 2010: Kkh-pt [4].

<i>Samantapāsādikā:</i> Kurundī (Pārājika 2 M)	—	—	—	boundary = one stone throw from the precincts of a house ( <i>gharūpacāra</i> )
<i>Samantapāsādikā:</i> <i>Mahāpaccarī</i> (Pārājika 2 M)	—	—	—	boundary = one stone throw from the precincts of a house ( <i>gharūpacāra</i> )
<i>Samantapāsādikā:</i> <i>Mahā-Aṭṭhakathā</i> (Pārājika 2 M, Pācittiya 85 M)	—	—	boundary = one stone throw from the <i>ghar-</i> <i>ūpacāra</i>	boundary = another stone throw from there (i.e. from the village)
<i>Andhakathakathā</i> (Pārājika 2 M, Pācittiya 85 M, Saṅghādisesa 3 N)	—	—	—	boundary = space for an enclosure
<i>Samantapāsādikā</i> (Sīmā rules)	—	—	—	boundary = space for an enclosure ( <i>parikkhepokāsa</i> )
<i>Samantapāsādikā</i> (Saṅghādisesa 3 N)	boundary = enclosure ( <i>parikkhepa</i> )	—	—	boundary = space appro- priate for an enclosure ( <i>parikkhepārahaṭṭhāna</i> )

Definitions of *gāma* and *gāmūpacāra***The offence of staying behind a group**

One *apare*-quotation in the *Anugaṇṭhipada* refers to the offence of staying behind a group alone. As already mentioned, nuns had to live within settlements. For monks it was recommended to live neither too close nor too far away from a village, and this was taken into consideration when places for monasteries were selected.<sup>74</sup> Thus monks' monasteries should be situated outside of villages which in fact is what Geiger tells us with respect to Sri Lanka, and what can be learned from an information of the *Mahā-Aṭṭhakathā* handed down in the *Samantapāsādikā*. There we are told that a nun who remains outside the court of the Mahābodhi tree etc.<sup>75</sup> when the group of nuns enters it, commits the offence

<sup>74</sup> Vin I 399: *gāmato n' eva avidūre na accāsanne*.

<sup>75</sup> Sp 912,29–9137: *agāmake araṇṇe ti* (Vin IV 230,18) *ettha nikkhamitvā bahi indakhilā sabbam etaṃ araṇṇan ti* (Vibh 251,17–18) *evaṃ vuttalakkaṇaṃ eva araṇṇaṃ. taṃ pan' etaṃ kevalaṃ gāmābhāvena 'agāmakān' ti vuttaṃ, na Viñjhāṭṭhavisadisatāya. tādisa araṇṇe okkante dassanūpacāre vijahite sace pi savanūpacāro atthi, āpatti. ten' eva vuttaṃ Aṭṭhakathāyaṃ: sace bhikkhunīsu Mahābodhi-aṅgaṇaṃ pavisaṇṭīsu ekā bahi tiṭṭhati, tassāpi āpatti. Lohapāsādaṃ pavisaṇṭīsu pi parivenaṃ pavisaṇṭīsu pi es' eva nayo. Mahācetiyaṃ vandamānāsu ekā uttaradvārena nikkhamitvā gacchati, tassāpi āpatti. Thūpārāmaṃ pavisaṇṭīsu ekā bahi tiṭṭhati, tassāpi āpatti ti.* “In the wilderness without settlements: Here wilderness is only that which has the characteristic described in the [following] way: **having left [the village], outside of the door post [of the village door] all that is wilderness** (definition of the Ābhidhammikas). This, however, is described as ‘without settlements’, because of the absence of settlements, not because of its similarity with the Viñjha-wood. If [a nun] has entered such a wilderness and has left the sighting distance [of a second nun], an offence [arises for her] even if hearing distance still is given. Only therefore [it is said] in the [*Mahā-*]Aṭṭhakathā: **If nuns enter the court of the Mahābodhi [tree, and] one remains**

of staying behind the group alone. This offence can only be committed in the wilderness (Vin IV 230,18–29), i.e. outside the village gate of the village from which the nun sets off. The Mahāvihāra of Anurādhapura is—as is well-known—a monks’ monastery and in fact lay outside the town of Anurādhapura.<sup>76</sup> Therefore it is wilderness for nuns according to the definition.<sup>77</sup> This probably is the reason why monks’ monasteries are defined as being “unallowable ground” (*akappiyabhūmi*) for nuns, as we learn implicitly from the *Andhakatṭhakathā* (see above), and explicitly from the *Vinayavinicchaya* written by the South Indian Buddhaddatta (5th/6th century),<sup>78</sup> and from the *apare* quoted in the *Anugaṇṭhipada*. The latter refer to the Khandhadhammavihāra in Kāñcī and the Sārīdhammavihāra in Kāvīrapaṭṭana as such unallowable places.<sup>79</sup> Thus South India and Sri Lanka accord with respect to the inadmissibility of monks’ monasteries for nuns which probably resulted from their being situated outside of villages. It should, however, not be concealed that there exist traces of monasteries localised within a city,<sup>80</sup> namely the *antarārāma*, “a monastery [lying] within [a settlement]”.<sup>81</sup> If these were monks’ monasteries we would have to suppose that at some time and in some region monks’ monasteries were built within settlements too. In that case, however, the space of the monks’ monastery, if it had an own determined monastic boundary, was excluded from the village, and thus the space within the monks’ monastery too would have been *akappiṇa* for nuns.

An aggravation of the subrule not to stay behind a group alone is to be observed in the

---

outside, for her too an offence [arises]. The same is valid in case [nuns] enter the Lohapāsāda or a Pariveṇa. If [nuns] venerate the Mahācetiya [and] one [nun] goes away leaving through the northern door, for her too an offence [arises]. If [nuns] enter the Thūpārāma, [and] one remains outside, for her too an offence arises.”

<sup>76</sup> Cf. Geiger 1986: pp. 58–59. See also the remark in Dhammasiri’s *Gaṇṭhipada* (Vjb 360,14–15), according to which the example given in the *Mahā-Aṭṭhakathā* shows that the offence to stay behind a group alone is also committed in close distance to towns which refers to the localization of the Mahāvihāra close to the town of Anurādhapura.

<sup>77</sup> In a different context also the *no takko ti ācariyo* tells us that only a nunnery is an allowable ground (*kappiyabhūmi*). Vjb 346,11–15: *bhikkhuniyo ce vāsūpagā honti, bhikkhunupassayo va kappiyabhūmi. yatha bhikkhuniyo ekarattam pi vasanti, ayaṃ bhikkhunupassayo ti* (≠ Vin IV 57,6–7) *vacanato tāsam samīpaṃ vā tāhi gahitavāsāgāraṃ vā “gacchāmi” ti gacchato yathāsukhaṃ gantuṃ vaṭṭati. na hi tāvatā taṃ gharaṃ antaragharasankhyaṃ gacchatīti no takko ti ācariyo*. “If nuns entered a habitation, only the nunnery is an allowable space. On account of the statement that **wherever a bhikkhunī spends even one night, that is a nunnery**, [a monk] who goes [with the words]: ‘I go into their vicinity or to the house accepted by them for living’, is allowed to go according to his liking. For, on that account a house is not counted as »between the houses«, [this] is our reasoning’, [says] the Ācariya.”

<sup>78</sup> Vin-vn, Vs. 2040: *bhikkhunīnaṃ vihārassa bhūmi tāsam tu kappiṇā. hoti bhikkhuvihārassa bhūmi tāsam akappiṇā*. “The floor of a nuns’ monastery for them, however, is allowable. The floor of a monks’ monastery is unallowable for them.”

<sup>79</sup> Vjb 359,7–14, Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 256].

<sup>80</sup> From the *anāpatti* formula to Pāc 46 M (Vin IV 101,5–7) which is a rule also valid for nuns (Pāc 127 N) we learn that four places are *kappiyabhūmi* for monks, and thus also should be for nuns, namely the *antarārāma* (E° wrongly *antaragāma*), i.e. a monastery within [a settlement], a *bhikkhunupassaya*, a *titthiyaseyya*, “space for adherents of others”, and a *paṭikkamana* (i.e. corresponds to *āsanasālā* in other rules), i.e. a hall for gathering and functioning as a refectory.

<sup>81</sup> That *antarārāma* is to be understood as an “*ārāma* within [a settlement]”, not as “into the park” (CPD s.v.) in this connection is shown by the explanation given in the *Samantapāsādikā* (857,18–19: *antarārāman ti anto gāme vihāro hoti taṃ gacchatī*), and confirmed by at least two *Ṭikās* (Vin-vn-ṭ, Kkh-ṭ).

*Anugaṇṭhipada* which applies that rule not only to the “wilderness”, but even to the *gāma*. According to the *Anugaṇṭhipada*’s opinion a nun commits this offence within a village, if she stays there while the other nuns leave. She becomes guilty the very moment the group of nuns transgresses the boundary of the village given that she is out of sighting or hearing distance.<sup>82</sup> The contradictions to the statements in the *Vinaya* caused by this interpretation are solved by the *Anugaṇṭhipada* in stating that the *Vinaya* speaks of *agāmaṇa arañña* in order to indicate that the offence of staying behind a group is committed in the very moment, in which one leaves the village, and since the decision to leave the village is reached within the village, *agāmaṇa arañña* refers to the moment the decision is made.<sup>83</sup> Since none of the other commentaries discusses this case,<sup>84</sup> we, unfortunately, do not know how widespread this interpretation was.<sup>85</sup> If the rule were applied in that way, it would be a further restriction of the free moving space for nuns, because no single nun could stay in her village alone when the others left.

## Conclusion

The references to nuns in our “South Indian Sources” are limited. This partly is due to the general state of transmission partly due to the fact that passages commenting on *bhikkhunīs* are only few. They document, however, that nuns’ communities of some Theravāda tradition existed in South India—our “South Indian Sources” did neither belong to the Abhayagirivāsin nor to the Mahāsāṃghika—in the time before and after the *Samantapāsādikā*, because our sources deal with nuns’ rules and in part slightly deviate from mainstream Mahāvihāra. It is to be supposed that the relations between the South Indian Theravādins and those from Sri Lanka can be defined more clearly if the comparison is made on a grander scale, and if similar texts with a clear regional localization in South India or Sri Lanka are compared as for example the *Vinayavinicchaya* and the *Khuddasikkhā*.

## ABBREVIATIONS:

M = Monks

N = Nuns

Niss = Nissaggiya offence

---

<sup>82</sup> If two nuns remain within the village, each of them commits this offence only, if she is outside of sighting and hearing distance of the other nun (Vjb 360,1–15; Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 259]). The *Anugaṇṭhipada* furthermore states that this offence is not restricted to the space of time when a nun walks on a road in the wilderness.

<sup>83</sup> The *Anugaṇṭhipada* draws on a passage dealing with the suspension of the rules subsumed under Sgh 3 N for a nun who awoke as a nun after sex change.

<sup>84</sup> The author of the *Vajirabuddhiṭikā* rejects the justification of the *Anugaṇṭhipada*, but does not take a further opinion on the statement.

<sup>85</sup> In the same context the *Anugaṇṭhipada* teaches in addition that the offence of staying behind the group alone is committed only once, whereas offences against the other three subrules are committed with each other village, each crossing of the river, etc. This is stated in a similar way in the Kkh-pt (Kieffer-Pülz 2013: [Z 259]).



Pāc = Pācittiya offence  
Pār = Pārājika offence  
Sgh = Saṃghādisesa offence

## REFERENCES:

### PRIMARY LITERATURE

Kkh = *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī*

Kkh-pt = *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī-purāṇaṭṭhā*, Rangoon, 1961 (Chs), 1–117.

Kkh-ṭ = Buddhanāga, *Vinayaṭṭhamaṇḍīyā nāma Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī-abhinavaṭṭhā*, Rangoon, 1961 (Chs), 118–489.

Sp = *Samantapāsādikā, Vinayaṭṭhakathā*, 7 Vols., ed. J. Takakusu, M. Nagai (and K. Mizuno in Vols. 5 and 7), London, 1924–1947 (PTS); Vol. 8: Indexes Hermann Kopp, London (PTS).

Sp-ṭ = Sāriputta [of Poṭṭonaruva], *Sāratthadīpanī*, 3 Vols., Rangoon, 1960 (Chs).

Vin = *Vinaya Piṭaka*, 5 Vols., ed. Hermann Oldenberg, London, 1879–1883.

Vin-vn = Buddhadatta, *Vinayavinicchaya*, in: *Buddhadatta's Manuals*, pt. 2: *Vinayavinicchaya and Uttaravinicchaya, Summaries of the Vinaya Piṭaka*, ed. A. P. Buddhadatta, London, 1927 (PTS), 1–230.

Vin-vn-ṭ = *Vinayavinicchayaṭṭhā* (*Vinayaṭṭhasārasandīpanī*), 2 Vols., Rangoon, 1977 (Chs).

Vjb = *Vajirabuddhiṭṭhā*, Rangoon, 1960 (Chs)

### SECONDARY LITERATURE:

BD = I. B. Horner, *The Book of the Discipline (Vinaya-Piṭaka)*, 6 vols., London, 1938–1966 (SBB 10, 11, 13, 14, 20, 25).

Bollée 1985 = W. B. Bollée, [Review to] K. R. Norman, Pāli Literature, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 105/1, 178–179.

Cousins, L. S. 2010 = L. S. Cousins, “On the Vibhajjavādins. The Mahimsāsaka, Dhammaguttaka, Kassapiya and Tambapaṇṇiya branches of the ancient Theriyas”, *Buddhist Studies Review* 18, 2 (2001), 131–182.

Cousins (unpubl.) = L. S. Cousins, “Tambapaṇṇiya and Tāmraśāṭiya”, [unpublished article; pdf [www.ocbs.org/people/fellows-ocbsmain-152/157-lance-cousins](http://www.ocbs.org/people/fellows-ocbsmain-152/157-lance-cousins); last access, 20.6.2012].

CPD = *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*, begun by V. Trenckner, ed. D. Andersen, H. Smith, H. Hendriksen, Vols. 1–3, Copenhagen 1924ff.

Geiger 1986 = Wilhelm Geiger, *Culture of Ceylon in mediaeval times*, ed. Heinz Bechert, 2nd ed., Stuttgart.

Golzio 2010 = Karl-Heinz Golzio, *Die Ausbreitung des Buddhismus in Süd- und Südostasien: eine quantitative Untersuchung auf der Basis epigraphischer Quellen*, Frankfurt (Religionswissenschaft, Bd. 16).

von Hinüber 1996 = O. von Hinüber, *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*, Berlin (Indian Philology and South Asian Studies, Vol. 2).

Kieffer-Pülz 1993 = Petra Kieffer-Pülz, “Zitate aus der Andhaka-Aṭṭhakathā in der Samantapāsādikā”, *Studien zur Indologie und Buddhismuskunde. Festgabe des Seminars für Indologie und Buddhismuskunde für Prof. Dr. Heinz Bechert*, ed. R. Grünendahl et alii, Bonn (Indica et Tibetica, 22), 171–212.

Kieffer-Pülz 1994 = Petra Kieffer-Pülz, “Bemerkungen zu dem Wort jagatī”, *Festschrift Klaus Bruhn zur Vollendung des 65. Lebensjahres*, ed. Nalini Balbir et alii, Reinbek, 339–359.

Kieffer-Pülz 2005 = Petra Kieffer-Pülz, “Die Klassifizierung des Alkoholverbots in der buddhistischen Rechtsliteratur der Theravādin”, *Im Dickicht der Gebote. Studien zur Dialektik von Norm und Praxis in der Buddhismusgeschichte Asiens*, ed. Peter Schalk, Uppsala (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Historia Religionum, 26), 153–223.

Kieffer-Pülz 2009 = Petra Kieffer-Pülz, “The Ganthārambhakathā of Upasena's Saddhammapajjotikā and Vajirabuddhi's Vajirabuddhiṭṭhā”, *Indo-Iranian Journal* 52, 143–177.

Kieffer-Pülz 2010 = Petra Kieffer-Pülz, “Zitate aus der Andhakatṭhakathā in den Subkommentaren”, *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* (2010), 147–235.

Kieffer-Pülz 2013 = Petra Kieffer-Pülz, *Verlorene Ganthipadas zum buddhistischen Ordensrecht. Untersuchungen zu den in der Vajirabuddhiṭṭhā zitierten Kommentaren Dhammasiris und Vajirabuddhis*,



- 3 Bde., Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag (Veröffentlichungen der Indologischen Kommission, 1).  
*Proceedings and Transactions of the Second Oriental Conference: Calcutta January 28th to February 1st, 1922, Calcutta 1923.*
- Ramchandran 1996 = A. Ramchandran, *The Cultural History of Lower Kṛṣṇa Valley: Its contacts with Southeast Asia*, Jaipur.
- Soundara Rajan 1994 = K. V. Soundara Rajan, *Kaveripattinam excavations 1963–73 (A port city on the Tamilnadu coast)*, New Delhi (Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India, No. 90).
- VAV = Jens-Uwe Hartmann, *Das Varṇārḥavarṇastotra des Mātr̥ceṭa*, Göttingen, 1987 (Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden, 12; AAWG 160).